

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 15-26 have been canceled without prejudice due to the restriction requirement. Claims 1, 6 and 12 have been amended and claims 5 and 11 have been canceled. No new matter has been introduced by the amendment.

1. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Adachi et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0100598) in view of Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,341,231). Claims 6 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Adachi in view of Yamamoto and further in view of Gotoh et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0154256). The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections based on the following remarks.

Gotoh describes an LCD which includes both an upper substrate 301 and a lower substrate 311 (see paragraph 240, lines 1-3 and lines 7-10) with fluorine-based liquid crystal layers 309a/b (see paragraph 242, lines 3-5) and a scattering liquid crystal layer EM (see paragraph 186, lines 1-6, and paragraph 240, lines 4-6) disposed therebetween. Since the EM and the transparent polyimide layer 308 that formed on the EM are disposed between the two liquid crystal layers 309a and 309b, both the upper substrate and the lower substrate are required. Light propagates through the EM and polyimide layer (see paragraph 186-187).

In contrast to the device disclosed by Gotoh, according to the LCD module recited in amended claim 1 and original claims 6 and 12, the liquid crystal display panel is disposed on an upper portion of the low refractive index layer, which is disposed on the light guide panel. The liquid crystal

display panel includes an upper substrate but no substrate is disposed between the liquid crystal and the light guide panel. Since the liquid crystal display panel is disposed on the top of the light guide panel, the device recited in claims 6 and 12 comprises the liquid crystal display panel without a second substrate.

In view of the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that Adachi in view of Yamamoto and further in view of Gotoh does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations and thus a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established (see MPEP 2143). Accordingly rejection against original claims 6 and 12 has been overcome and should be withdrawn.


In view of the above amendment and remarks, rejections against claims 1-4, 6-10 and 12-14 have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

4. Conclusion

Based on the above amendment and remarks, the Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. The examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

Date: August 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610
(312) 321-4200